DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 416 CG 030 634

AUTHOR Struckman-Johnson, Cindy; Anderson, Peter B.; Struckman-Johnson, David

TITLE Tactics and Motives of Sexually Aggressive College Women and Men.

PUB DATE 2000-08-00

NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Psychological Association (108th, Washington, DC, August 4-8, 2000).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Aggression; *Assertiveness; College Students; Higher Education; Interpersonal Attraction; Interpersonal Relationship; Intimacy; *Sex Differences; *Sexuality; *Social Behavior

ABSTRACT

Previous research findings were used in this study to develop and compare categories of the commonly used tactics and motives of sexually aggressive college women and men. In the collaborative work, 43% of the men and 26% of the women said they had perpetrated at least one act of sexual persistence. Based upon the reports of sexual targets, sexually aggressive women were less exploitative than males. Women were less likely to lie, purposefully get a man drunk for sex, or use a high level of physical force. However, sexually aggressive women appear to be as willing as sexually aggressive men to use the authority of their age to pressure for sex; to take advantage of persons who are already intoxicated; and to block the retreat of a reluctant sexual target. Research has suggested that sexually aggressive males can be characterized by dominant personalities; an adversarial stance towards women; membership in hyper-masculine peer groups; and a preference for casual sex. These characteristics can also define some female sexually aggressive behavior along with two other traits. Some sexually aggressive women are motivated by a desire for romance and intimacy, while others may pressure a man into sex because they misjudged his sexual interest. (Contains 2 tables and 21 references.) (JDM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 416



# Tactics and Motives of Sexually Aggressive College Women and Men

Cindy Struckman-Johnson
University of South Dakota

Peter B. Anderson
University of New Orleans

David Struckman-Johnson
University of South Dakota

## Abstract

The results from the authors' previous research were used to develop and compare categories of the most commonly used tactics and motives of sexually aggressive college women and men. The most frequently used tactics by both sexes were persistent sexual touching and kissing, the removal of clothing, repeated requests, deception, and taking advantage of or contributing to the intoxicated state of targets. The tactics of persistent touching and kissing, verbal requests, deception, getting a victim drunk, and physical restraint were used by more men than women. The primary motives of sexually aggressive women and men were being sexual aroused, being sexually attracted to the target, and desiring to give the target an exciting experience. Examples of survey respondents' personal accounts of sexual coercion experiences are presented.

Paper presented at the 108th annual convention of the American Psychological Association,
Symposium: Gender Differences and Similarities in Sexual Coercion—
Mechanisms of Psychopathology,
Gordon C. Nagayama Hall, Chair. Washington, D.C., August, 2000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Struckman-Johnson
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)



CG030634

## Review of the Literature

Sexually aggressive behavior among college students has been studied for decades. Between 1950 and the early 1980s, the research focused on the female victim and the male perpetrator. One of the most influential studies was by Koss, Gidycz, and Wisniewski, 1987, who found that 28% of the women in a national sample of over 6,000 college students had experienced rape or attempted rape. About 8% of the men indicated that they had perpetrated rape. In this survey, like many others conducted during this time period, only women were asked about being victims and only men were asked about being perpetrators of coercive sexual behavior.

In the 1980s, a small number of investigators began to ask men, as well as women, about their experiences as victims of sexual aggression. For example, Struckman-Johnson (1988) reported that 16% of 268 men and 22% of 355 women surveyed at a small Midwestern college had experienced forced sexual intercourse while on a date. Similar results were published by Aizenman and Kelley (1988), who documented that 14% of men and 29% of women in a sample of over 300 students from an Eastern school had been forced to have intercourse against their will. In a survey of nearly 1,000 students at a Texas university, Muehlenhard and Cook (1988) found that 46% of the men and 63% of the women had engaged in unwanted sexual activity due to partner or normative pressures.

In the 1990s, there were at least a dozen published surveys on the prevalence of sexual coercion among male and female college students. For example, Lottes (1991) reported that 24% of the men and 35% of the women in a classroom sample of over 300 students at an Eastern college had been coerced into sexual intercourse. In 1996, Hogben, Byrne, and Hamburger found that 52% of the men and 79% of the women in a sample of 200 Eastern college students reported having one or more sexually coercive experiences. In a longitudinal study of over 1000 adults (one half of whom were college students), Zweig, Barber, and Eccles (1997) documented that 13% of the men and 32% of the women were pressured into sexual intercourse. Larimer, Lydum, Anderson, and Turner (1999) surveyed a sample of nearly 300 men and women in the Greek system at a Western college and found that statistically equivalent percentages of the men (21%) and women (28%) had experienced unwanted sexual contact.

Several studies revealed that sexual victimization occurred among college students in other countries. In 1995, Australian researchers McConaghy and Amir found that 30% of the men and 35% of the women in a class of 190 medical students had experienced physically forced sexual intercourse since the age of 13. Lotts and Weinberg (1996) documented that levels of sexual victimization were much higher among American college men (50%) and women (69%) than among young Swedish men (22%) and women (41%). O'Sullivan, Byers, and Finkelman (1998) reported that of a random sample of 433 students in two Canadian universities, 24% of the men and 42% of the women had experienced some type of sexual coercion in a heterosexual dating context.

Several tentative conclusions can be drawn from this research. In nearly every study, the percentage of women who were sexually coerced was significantly greater than the percentage of

men. Therefore, the research revealed that sexual victimization was not an "equal opportunity" event for the sexes—women were the primary victims. However, the research established that substantial percentages of men were sexually coerced by women—an outcome that could not be ignored or trivialized. Another finding was that women had a more adverse reaction to heterosexual sexual coercion than did men (O'Sullivan & Byers, 1998), although there was evidence that some types of male victims showed more negative effects than female victims (e.g., Larimer, et al., 1999; Zweig et al., 1998).

A third conclusion was that the number of men and women who admitted to perpetrating sexual coercion was much smaller than the number who said they were victimized (e.g., Larimer, et al., 1999; O'Sullivan et al., 1998; Struckman-Johnson, 1988.) One consequence is that only small samples of sexually aggressive college men and women have been studied. A fourth finding was that men were more likely than women to use physical force to obtain sexual contact (e.g., Larimer et al., 1999; Struckman-Johnson, 1988; Zweig et al., 1997). A fifth finding was that many men and women cited intoxication as a factor in their sexual coercion (Larimer et al., 1999; Lottes, 1991; O'Sullivan et al., 1998.)

## The Authors' Research on Tactics and Motives

Much of our research in the 1990s has focused on the use of physical force, intoxication, and other tactics in female sexual aggression. We have investigated the question of how women accomplish sexual contact with reluctant men without, for the most part, resorting to physical force. What sexual behaviors do they enact? What words of persuasion or deception do they use? To what extent do they take advantage of inebriated men or purposely give alcohol to men for sexual interaction? And, in the infrequent situations when women do use physical force, how do they restrain men who are, on the average, bigger and stronger?

In one of our first investigations, Anderson and Aymami (1993) asked 212 female students in an Eastern college about the technique they had used in attempts to have sexual contact with a man. The most common strategy was sexual arousal of the partner—used by 80% of the women. Fifty two percent of the women had attempted to have sexual contact with a man while he was drunk or stoned, but only 15% said they had got a man drunk or stoned for this purpose. Twenty five percent admitted that they had "said things she didn't mean". Smaller percentages of the women had pressured men with arguments (11%), questioned the man's sexuality (9%), and threatened to break up their relationship (8%). The least used strategies included use of physical force (6%), threat of physical force (4%), and threat with a weapon (.9%).

We took a different approach in another investigation and asked 314 college men to describe sexually coercive incidents that they had undergone since the age of 16 (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1998). Forty three percent of the men said that they had been pressured or forced by a girl or woman to have sexual contact. Ninety percent of the male targets had been subjected to a pressure tactic such as "persuasion" (reported by 75% of the targets), and a "got you drunk" tactic (reported by 40% of targets). The third most common tactic was threatening to break up the relationship (reported by 19% of the targets). Women used a force tactic (physical restraint, threat of harm, and harm) in only 10% of the incidents.

The Collaboration Study of Sexual Persistence

Recently, we collaborated on a third study (Struckman-Johnson, Anderson, Struckman-Johnson, & Newton, 1998) in which we addressed some limitations of our prior research. In the Anderson and Aymami study (1993), women were asked about any attempt to initiate sexual contact. It was not stated whether the man was willing or unwilling. In our collaborative work, we assessed the behavior of "sexual persistence"—an attempt to have sex with someone who is clearly reluctant. We asked participants if, since the age of 16, they had ever been pressured or forced by someone of the opposite sex to have sexual contact (touching of sexual parts or sexual intercourse) even though they had indicated "no" to the sexual advance. If so, they checked which of 19 tactics were used in the most recent incident. Participants were also asked if they had ever perpetrated an act of sexual persistence and, if so, what tactics did they use.

In our past research, we had not always made equal assessments of victimization and perpetration by gender. In our collaborative study, we asked men and women to describe incidents in which they experienced and used tactics of sexual persistence with the opposite sex. We also improved the list of sexual coercion tactics used in our prior research. We used most of the tactics from the Anderson and Aymami study (1993), and added specific arousal tactics of kissing/ touching and removal of clothing. We also added a tactic of "blocking the retreat" of the target because women sometimes use this type of restraint. Finally, we developed a new measure of motives in which targets were asked, "What were his/her reasons for doing this?" and perpetrators were asked, "What were your reasons for doing this?" A list of 12 motives developed from our prior research followed each of the questions.

We distributed our new survey to 656 college students--213 men and 246 women from the University of South Dakota and 62 men and 134 women from the University of New Orleans. The anonymous survey was administered to students in general psychology, social psychology, sex roles, and human sexuality classes. Separate survey forms for male and female participants were used so that the question had gender-appropriate language. Volunteer participants were asked to complete the survey in the privacy of their home and to return it by the next class meeting.

Results for Sexual Persistence Tactics. The results of the study revealed that 159 men (58% of the male sample) and 297 women (78% of the female sample) had been the target of at least one tactic of sexual persistence. One hundred and seventeen men (43% of the male sample) and 101 women (26% of the female sample) said they had perpetrated at least one tactic of sexual persistence. For the present paper, we summarized the data on tactics of sexual persistence from the targets' perspective in Table 1. We used the target data because there were more targets than perpetrators, and because the targets had experienced a greater variety of tactics than were used (or admitted to) by the perpetrator group.

Table 1.

Most Common Tactics of Sexual Persistence Experienced by College Men and Women

| | Men Experiencing the Tactic (N=275) | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Female Tactics | N | Percent | |
| 1. Persistent touching and kissing | 138 | 50.5 | * |
| 2. Taking off her own clothes | 113 | 41.1 | |
| 3. Taking off man's clothes | 104 | 37.8 | |
| 4. Making repeated requests | 101 | 36.9 | * |
| 5. Taking advantage of a drunken man | 81 | 29.5 | |
| 6. Telling lies | 59 | 21.5 | * |
| 7. Blocking a man's retreat | 53 | 19.3 | |
| 8. Using physical restraint | 35 | 12.7 | * |
| 9. Getting a man drunk | 30 | 10.9 | * |
| 10. Using authority of older age | 24 | 8.7 | |
| 11. Questioning man's sexuality | 21 | 7.6 | |
| 12. Using physical harm | 17 | 6.2 | |
| 13. Threatening self-harm | 15 | 5.5 | |
| 14. Threatening break up | 12 | 4.4 | |
| 15. Threat of blackmail | 10 | 3.6 | |
| | Women Experiencing the Tactic (N=380) | | |
| Male Tactics | N | Percent | |
| 1. Persistent touching and kissing | 269 | 70.8 | * |
| 2. Making repeated requests | 250 | 65.8 | * |
| 3. Taking off woman's clothes | 190 | 50.0 | |
| 4. Telling lies | 161 | 42.4 | * |
| 5. Taking advantage of a drunken woman | 160 | 42.1 | |
| 6. Taking off his own clothes | 140 | 36.8 | |
| 7. Getting a woman drunk | 95 | 25.0 | * |
| 8. Using physical restraint | 88 | 23.2 | * |
| 9. Blocking a woman's retreat | 80 | 21.0 | |
| 10. Using authority of older age | 51 | 13.4 | |
| 11. Threatening a break up | 36 | 9.5 | |
| 12. Questioning women's sexuality | 35 | 9.2 | |
| 13. Physically harming the women | 33 | 8.7 | |
| 14. Threatening physical harm | 24 | 5.3 | |
| 15. Using authority of position | 20 | 6.3 | |

Note. Percentages add to more than 100 because multiple tactics were reported.

* Chi-square tests revealed a significant difference between the distributions for men and women in a tactic category ($p < .0001$.)

The most common tactic of sexually persistent women was continued touching and kissing—an experience claimed by about half of the men. The other most common tactics were taking off of the woman's own clothes, taking off the man's clothes, and making repeated requests. The fifth-ranked strategy was taking advantage of a drunken man. The next most-used strategies were telling lies and blocking of a man's retreat, followed by use of physical restraint, and getting a man drunk. The tenth-ranked tactic, experienced by 9% of the men, was using the authority of older age, defined in our survey as the woman being at least five years older than the target. The remaining strategies were reported by less than 8% of the male sample.

The most common tactic of sexually persistent men was continued touching and kissing—an experience reported by 71% of the women. The second most common tactic was making repeated requests, followed by taking off the woman's clothes. The next most-common tactics were telling lies and taking advantage of a drunken woman, followed by taking off of the man's own clothes. The seventh-ranked tactic was getting a woman drunk, followed by the use of physical restraint and blocking of a woman's retreat. The tenth-ranked tactic was using the authority of older age, an experience claimed by 13% of the women. The remaining tactics were reported by less than 10% of the female sample.

Sexually persistent men and women used the same type of tactics in approximately the same rank order of frequency. However, a significantly greater proportion of men than women used the tactics of persistent touching and kissing (experienced by 71% of the female targets and 50% of the male targets), $\chi^2$ (1, $\underline{N}$ = 656) = 27.71, $\underline{p} < .0001$. A greater proportion of men used repeated requests (reported by 66% of the female targets and 37% of the male targets), $\chi^2$ (1, $\underline{N}$ =656) = 53.58, $\underline{p} < .0001$. More men than women told lies (experienced by 42% of the female targets and 22% of the male targets), $\chi^2$ (1, $\underline{N}$ = 656) = 20.51, $\underline{p} < .0001$. Also, more men than women got a target drunk (reported by 25% of the female targets and 11% of the male targets), $\chi^2$ (1, $\underline{N}$ = 656) = 20.51, $\underline{p} < .0001$. Finally, a greater percentage of men than women used physical restraint (experienced by 23% of the female targets and 13% of the male targets), $\chi^2$ (1, $\underline{N}$ = 656) = 20.13, $\underline{p} < .0001$.

Sexually persistent men and women were equally likely to use the tactics of taking off one's own clothes (experienced by 37% of the female targets and 41% of the male targets), taking off the targets' clothes (reported by 50% of the female targets and 38% of the male targets), and taking advantage of a target who is already drunk (experienced by 42% of the female targets and 30% of the male targets). They were equivalent in their use of blocking a targets' retreat (reported by 21% of the female targets and 19% of the male targets), and using the authority of older age (reported by 13% of the female targets and 9% of the male targets).

Results for Sexual Persistence Motives. See Table 2 for the five most-frequently cited motives of sexually persistent men and women. The male and female perpetrators were in close agreement on why they had been sexually persistent in the most recent incident. Chi-square tests confirmed that there were no significant differences in the distributions of men and women for motive categories. The number one motive was being sexually aroused, cited by 87% of the men

Table 2.

Most common motives for sexually persistent college women and men

| Female Motives | Persistent Women (N = 96) | |
|---|---|---|
| | N | Percent |
| 1. Was sexually aroused | 77 | 80.2 |
| 2. Was sexually attracted to the target | 68 | 70.8 |
| 3. Wanted to give the target an exciting sexual adventure | 32 | 33.3 |
| 4. Wanted a relationship with the target | 22 | 22.9 |
| 5. Was too drunk to control self | 19 | 19.8 |
| **Male Motives** | **Persistent Men (N=115)** | |
| | N | Percent |
| 1. Was sexually aroused | 100 | 87.0 |
| 2. Was sexually attracted to the target | 87 | 75.7 |
| 3. Wanted to give the target an exciting sexual adventure | 44 | 38.3 |
| 4. Was too drunk to control self | 24 | 21.2 |
| 5. Wanted a relationship with the target | 19 | 16.5 |

Note. Percentages add to more than 100 because multiple motives were reported. Chi-square tests revealed no significant differences between the distributions of men and women in motive categories.

and 80% of the women. This reason generally co-occurred with the motive of being sexually attracted to the target. A distant third-ranked motive (cited by about over one third of the perpetrators) was the desire to give the target an exciting sexual adventure. For women, the fourth-ranked motive was wanting a relationship with the target, closely followed by being too drunk to control herself (cited by 20% - 23%). For men, the fourth-ranked motive was being too drunk to control oneself, followed closely by wanting a relationship with the target (cited by 16%-21%).

Only small percentages of the male and female perpetrators endorsed the other motives on the list, and there were no significant differences in the distributions. Thirteen percent of the females said they wanted power and control over the target, compared to 3% of the men. About 5% of the men and women said that they wanted to make someone else jealous. Five percent of the women said they did it because of past abuse, compared to 1% of the men. About 3% of the perpetrators said they wanted to break up the targets' relationship with another person. Only 2% of the perpetrators said they felt angry and aggressive at the time.

We presented the motive data from the perpetrators' point of view because we assumed that the person committing an act is in the best position to judge his/her own motives. However, we discovered that the targets were in close agreement with perpetrators about motives. Over 75% of the male targets and female targets agreed that the perpetrators' sexual arousal and sexual attraction to the target were the reasons for their incident. Almost the same percentages of male and female targets agreed with the male and female perpetrators that the other common motives were desire to give the target a sexual adventure, desire for a relationship, and being too drunk to control oneself.

## Summary and Examples of Tactics of Sexually Aggressive Men and Women

The percentages and rankings of the tactics and motives of sexually persistent college students cannot adequately convey the dynamics of sexual coercion that have been described to us by hundreds of survey participants. According to victim descriptions, perpetrators tend to use a series of tactics. If the target refuses to yield to the least negative tactics, the perpetrator will employ tactics that are increasingly exploitative until the target either gives in or leaves the situation. What follows is our conception of the levels of sexual coercion as defined by the degree of victim exploitation. For each level, we compare the strategies of sexually aggressive men and women. The tactics are illustrated with verbatim descriptions of incidents experienced by college women and men. The descriptions are from our files of past research and are presented here for the first time.

### Setting the Stage

Based on our survey results, the perpetrator and the target usually know each other. In at least half of the situations, the two are acquaintances, friends, or new dating partners. In at least a third of the cases, the two are seriously dating or engaged. Few situations involve a meeting of strangers. Two factors that often set the stage for sexual coercion are alcohol /drugs and isolation. Typically, the target and perpetrator are at a party, the bar, or a gathering of peers. Often, the

target or the perpetrator or both are high or intoxicated. By chance or more likely by design, the two end up in an isolated area—a room, car, outdoors, or another building or residence.

Level 1: Persistent Arousal

The incident usually begins when the perpetrator either asks for sex or begins touching and kissing the target. When the target expresses his/her refusal, the perpetrator usually responds first with persistent touching and kissing, repeated requests, and removal of clothing. Our data suggest that men are more likely than women to make repeated requests (e.g., pleading), perhaps because they are used to doing this in their role of sexual initiators. Women may be uncomfortable with such a direct tactic. According to our research, women are more likely to start removing their own clothing in an attempt to arouse the man and get him to change his mind. Men are more likely to begin removing the woman's clothing than taking off their own. The descriptions suggest that men remove their clothing in order to facilitate sexual interaction or penetration more so than as a way to arouse the target.

Here are descriptions of a man's arousal technique from a woman's perspective:

*He continued to try and touch my breasts, and he continued to kiss my neck and ears.* (The man was an acquaintance. There was no sexual activity. The effect on her is unknown.)

*He came over, had some drunks, helped me pack some of my kitchen stuff (was moving). He sat down behind me and massaged my shoulders. Then began hitting on me verbally, as well as physically. I ended it before very much time passed and it could go any further.* (The man was a friend. There was no sexual activity. The effect on her is unknown.)

*We were kissing etc and he kept asking if we could go "all the way". I told him no many times and finally gave in.* (The man was a boyfriend. The outcome was sexual intercourse. It hurt the relationship. She no longer trusted men.)

*We left a party & went to park. He was on top of me kissing me & stuff & trying to take all of my clothes off. He kept putting my hands down his pants & I kept pulling away. I made up some excuse for us to leave.* (The man was a boyfriend. The outcome was sexual touching. The effect on her is unknown.)

Women's styles of touching, kissing, and taking their clothes off are illustrated by these descriptions from male targets:

*She repeatedly kissed me rubbing her croch against my legs and then she started to take her clothes off.* (The woman was his girlfriend. The outcome was sexual intercourse. He regretted losing his virginity to her.)

*We were at her parents house getting intoxicated. She went to "go take a shower", but came out of the bathroom with only a robe on. She removed it and was naked and tried to grope me.* (The woman was an acquaintance. It hurt their friendship.)

*We were simply friends (or so I thought). We were riding around in my car one night & she asked me to pull over on a somewhat unused road down by the lake. After I stopped, she was on top of me, kissing & touching. She told me she wanted to do this for years & that she had protection. She was quite persistent at this and this went on for at least 30 minutes before she let up & accepted the fact that I wasn't going to do anything.* (The woman was an acquaintance. It hurt their friendship.)

*She asked me to bring her to the bank to get some money which was close to my house. Then she asked if I wanted something to eat I said yes, so we went to my apartment where she tried to kiss me. I told her to quit. She then grabbed my genitals and I quickly removed her had. She then took off her clothes and said take me. I laughed at her. She asked why didn't I want her. I replied because I have a girlfriend. Then she kept pushing the issue until I gave in.* (The woman was a friend. The outcome was sexual intercourse. It ruined their friendship.)

Level 2: Lies and Emotional Manipulation.

Using deception and emotional manipulation is, in our judgment, a higher level of exploitation than persistent sexual touching. Lies, false flattery, and emotional ploys are used to trick or unfairly pressure the target into having sex. Our data indicate that men are twice as likely as women to use deception in sexually coercive interactions. Although the telling of lies and emotional manipulation may take place at the beginning of an incident, these tactics come into full play when persistent sexual arousal is resisted. True to the stereotype, the lies told by men are usually false claims of love or affection. Another lie told by older men (e.g., late twenties) is that they are the same age as the woman. Presumably, this makes the men seem more trustworthy to the women. As shown in the following descriptions by female targets, classic stories of "blue balls" and other peculiarities of the male penis are still being used.

*He slowly worked his way into it. It began with kissing then touching. He then took off his and my shirt (which was fine) abut when he went for my jeans I said no, so he kissed and fondled awhile longer then tried again. Again, I said no & went into all those lies about blue-balls & how much he loved me & that I was really hurting him.* (She was with a boyfriend and the outcome was oral sex. It hurt the relationship.)

*Started kissing me, then he said that I couldn't get pregnant because he never had an ejaculation. I still told him no after he asked me several times to have sex.* (She was with her boyfriend and the outcome was genital touching. She broke up with him after this happened several times.)

*He continued to kiss me & fondle me & he took his pants off & unzipped mine – he started to stick his penus into me and I said "no"—he said "I promise I won't stick it in" – he proceeded to break his promise shortly after that.* (She was with an acquaintance and she has not seen him since the incident. It did not have a negative effect on her.)

*He kissed and touched me in private places. He performed oral sex on me. He was begging and trying to trick me by saying it was his finger. It was his penis though. Afterwards, I threw him off*

*of me.* (The man was an acquaintance. The outcome was sexual intercourse. It did not have a negative affect on her.)

Some male perpetrators also try to manipulate the emotions of women by telling them that they are "abnormal" to say no because "everybody is doing it". They may warn women that their relationship will end if they do not have sex. Some tell women that sex is what good friends do for each other or that sex with a new person is the best way to get over a break up. Women are flattered, told that they are the right kind of girl or the man's fantasy, that their time together will not be a one-night stand, and that they will be respected in the morning.

Female perpetrators also tell lies about being in love with or caring about a male target. They also try to manipulate men's emotions by flattery, questioning their masculinity or by asking why they are not good enough or pretty enough or loved enough for sex. Some desperate women find ways to blackmail men, and they may even threaten to kill themselves if denied sex. Here are some examples of women's lies and manipulation from the men's point of view:

*She kept telling me to stay. Made me feel sorry for her, kissed me, touched me, took her clothes off, told me she loved me.* (The woman was an acquaintance. The outcome was sexual intercourse. The man has not dated another woman since.)

*Indicated to me that I must be gay because we had went out for 3 months & I had not tried to have sex with her.* (The woman was a new girlfriend. No sex occurred. It hurt the relationship. He viewed her as a sexual predator).

*We had gone out for the previous two years and recently broken up. I had a new girlfriend of about four months, but cheated on her with my ex once before. My ex came over and tried to make out or have sex with her. I refused and she told me she would tell my girlfriend about last time if I didn't have sex with her. I gave in.* (The outcome was sexual intercourse. The ex told the girlfriend and he never spoke to either one again.)

*Entered my apt. to discuss recent break up, began to get real "handsy". Stated that if I didn't stop the pain by having sex with her she would find a way to "end it all". I could only assume she meant herself.* (The outcome was sexual touching. It hurt the relationship.)

Level 3: Exploitation of the Intoxicated

Sexual coercion of intoxicated individuals is, in our opinion, a higher level of exploitation than manipulation or lies. The targets are often too inebriated to consider requests, detect deception, give consent, or physically escape from the situation. The male or female perpetrator either takes the target to an isolated area or simply waits for the target to pass out in a convenient bedroom. In many cases, the perpetrator contributes to the targets' intoxication by offering drinks or drugs. According to our data, men are more likely than women to get someone drunk for the purpose of having sex. Here are some examples of how intoxicated women were exploited:

*I was drunk at his house & he told me I could sleep in his room. He left the room for awhile & he came back & locked the door. He started kissing me & I told him to stop. He started to kiss me again. I told him to leave me along very loudly & he finally did. (The man was a friend. It hurt their relationship).*

*I was very intoxicated and I don't remember the details. He was just very pressuring; he kept trying to talk me into it and messing around until I didn't have the ability to resist anymore.* (The man was an acquaintance. The outcome was sexual intercourse. It had a very negative effect on her sex life.)

*The guy got my friend and I drunk with 3 other guys. He took me away from the group into a cornfield. I don't remember much of the night, just that I had said " no" and the next thing I remember was how painful it was. Not a good experience for the "first time"*. (The man was an acquaintance. It had a negative effect on her later sexual relationships.)

*He gave me a drink that had drugs in it. I passed out and awoke while he was on top of me having sex*. (The man was an acquaintance. It had a very negative effect on later dating and sex life.)

Our surveys suggest that the intoxication tactic is very effective for sexually aggressive women. They do not need to make direct requests or be attractive to win over an inebriated man. Typically, the woman gets the man into bed or joins him in bed and initiates oral sex to get him sexually aroused. Sometimes, the woman gets on top of an aroused man and inserts his penis. In some cases, the inebriated man becomes so aroused that he becomes a participant in the sex. The following descriptions are from male targets who were intoxicated at the time of the incident:

*We were drunk and she kept buying me drinks. Later she grabbed my crotch & asked if it turned me on. Then unzipped my pants & proceeded with oral sex*. (The woman was an acquaintance. It did not have a negative effect on him.)

*Alcohol was involved. She undressed me, tried to arouse me by touching my genitals, oral sex, and trying to force me inside of her.* (The woman was an acquaintance. The outcome was sexual intercourse. It had a negative effect on him.)

*Well, I didn't like the girl & it was late in the evening. I had gotten drunk so I went to bed & she kept jumping in bed with me. So I faced the wall hoping she would figure out but she didn't, She grabed me & kissed me. Yuck*! (The woman was a stranger. The outcome was sexual touching. It had a negative effect on him.)

*At a party, she came up and began talking to me. I was already drinking some at the time. While playing cards, she talked me into finishing several of her drinks and beers. She said there was another party, and convinced me to go. I was too drunk to drive so she drove us. The "party" seemed to lack other people. After about ½ hour of kissing/making out, I was tired and wanted to go home. She said no and told me she wanted to have sex. I said no, but she continued to kiss me and try to talk me into it. When she produced a condom, I gave in.* (The woman was a

stranger. Sexual intercourse was the outcome. He was a virgin and felt somewhat used for awhile.)

Level 4: Physical Force and Harm

The highest level of sexual exploitation involves physical restraint, including attempts to trap or keep the target from leaving, threats of harm, and harm. Our data suggest that sexually aggressive men and women both use blocking and traps such as cars or locked rooms to keep targets from leaving. Men, however, are twice as likely to use physically forceful acts such as holding or pinning down a target. The following descriptions are from women who were raped:

*I was really drunk and he said that he would take care of me and take me home. He took me to my best friend's house and helped me up to the guest bedroom. He decided not to drive home and wanted to share the bed with me. He then started to kiss me and then became forceful once I told him to stop. He held me down and removed my clothes. I tried to fight back but he kept shoving his tongue down my throat and he was very strong and big build. He then proceeded to rape me. He left not long after.* (The man was an acquaintance. It has had very negative effect on her. She no longer enjoys sex.)

*I was at a party and I was drunk but still knew what I was doing. He asked me to go for a walk with him. I told him I would go but we were just going to walk down the street and back. He made sure my glass was full before we left. He talked me into jumping on a trampoline & he then pushed me down and pulled my pants down & forced his penis into me. Then told me that if I told anyone they won't believe me.* (The man was an acquaintance who she had turned down for sex when she was sober. She ended the friendship.)

*We were all drinking (I was with my older sister). This guy offered to bring me to go get cigarettes. Already being drunk I said yes. Trusting this guy. Well we never made it to the store. He brought me to the lake. That's when he brought himself on me. He was to strong. I couldn't get him off.* (The man was an acquaintance. The outcome was sexual intercourse. She has since avoided him.)

*Forced himself on me after a few drinks in a bar. When I tried to leave in my car (intoxicated) he climbed in and agressively attacked me sexually leaving numerous bruises on my backside. He kept slapping me on my ass, hurting me repeatedly. (The man was a* stranger and the outcome was sexual intercourse. He tried unsuccessfully to contact her again for a date. She quit drinking.)

Sexually aggressive women are unlikely to use high levels of force with male targets. Instead, they occasionally try to grab and hold on to men, push them down on beds and sit or lay on them, hit and slap them, and tie them up. Sometimes, they try to keep them in a locked car or room. Here are some examples of incidents where men said that a woman blocked their retreat, used physical restraint, or harmed them:

*She grabed my penis and was rubbing it. Begged and sat on me when I was drunk.* (The woman was an acquaintance. The outcome was sexual intercourse. It had a negative effect on him.)

*She pushed me on the bed, I was drunk and mad at her. She then laid on top of me and started kissing me and rubbing my genitals. She took off her clothes and pulled my pants down and performed oral sex. And from that point on she really didn't do anything. I* just took over. (The woman was a girlfriend. He regretted giving in. He broke up with her shortly after.)

*We had "made out" the weekend before, but I didn't want to continue any further because I was already dating a different girl. She got drunk and so did I, she wanted to "hook up again". But I thought it was a bad idea. She pinned me down at one point (it was kind of thrilling) but I left.* (It had no effect on their relationship.)

*She bit me because I broke up with her and that was her way of trying to get close so that I would reconsider.* (There was no sexual activity. It did not have a negative effect on him.)

*I already had a girlfriend and she tried to have sex with me. I told her no and she kept kissing me and touching me. She kept asking and trying to make me have sex with her. I was drunk and tried to leave. She stood in front of the door and after awhile she slapped me and let me go calling me names as I walked away.* (The woman was a friend. It ended the relationship.)

*I was in a bar with friends when a girl I had been with a couple of weeks earlier approached me, slid into the booth and started grabing my crotch. She slapped me when I asked her to leave.* (The woman was an ex-date. It had a negative effect on him.)

## Conclusion

In summary, we found, as have many other investigators, that there are far more sexually aggressive men than there are women. In our collaborative work (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1998), 43% of the men and 26% of the women said they had perpetrated at least one act of sexual persistence. Based upon the reports of sexual targets, sexually aggressive women are less exploitative than their male counterparts. Women are less likely to lie, purposefully get a man drunk for sex, and use a high level of physical force. This may account for findings in other studies that men sexually coerced by women are less upset than women who have been sexually coerced by men (O'Sullivan & Byers, 1998). However, sexually aggressive women appear to be as willing as sexually aggressive men to use the authority of their age to pressure for sex, to take advantage of persons who are already intoxicated, and to block the retreat of a reluctant sexual target.

We are unable to draw conclusions about the differences in motives of sexually aggressive men and women. The data from our collaborative study (Struckman-Johnson et al., 1998) suggest that, in the minds of perpetrator and targets alike, the major motives for sexual coercion are the sexual arousal of the perpetrators and strong sexual attraction to the target. But why do perpetrators get involved with reluctant sexual targets, and why do they persist when told "no"? We doubt that the motives of sexually aggressive men and women can really be understood until

we know more about their personalities, background, and beliefs. We know from past research that some sexually aggressive men may be characterized by dominant, impulsive, and insensitive personalities, an adversarial stance toward women, membership in hyper-masculine peer groups, and a preference for casual sex (e.g., Dean & Malamuth, 1997). One direction for future research would be the investigation of the characteristics of sexually aggressive women.

For the purpose of encouraging research, we suggest the investigation of three different types of sexually aggressive women. We speculate that there is a female counterpart to the sexually aggressive male who has a dominant personality, adversarial feelings about men, and an accepting attitude about casual sex. Most likely, she routinely preys upon men with little sense of compunction. There is some preliminary research evidence that sexually coercive women have an adversarial stance toward relations with men (Anderson, 1998) and a need for sexual power and control (Craig, 1998). Christopher, McQuaid, and Updegraff (1999) reported that sexual coercion was higher among women who had conflict in their relationships and were sexually dissatisfied.

We also think that some sexually aggressive women are motivated by a desire for romance and intimacy. In one of our own investigations (Struckman-Johnson & Struckman-Johnson, 1998), we proposed that some sexually aggressive women are motivated by a strong desire for intimacy with male targets who are "unavailable". The man may have another girlfriend or he is not interested in the target because she is unattractive or unacceptable. Essentially, the woman's act of sexual aggression is a desperate bid to get the man's interest. This proposal is supported by Zubriggen's (2000) finding that sexually aggressive behavior in women was motivated by a desire for affiliation and intimacy and not by power motivation.

A third type of sexually aggressive woman may not be a "type" at all, but is a woman who pressures or forces a man into sex because she has misjudged his sexual interest. Clements-Schreiber, Rempel, and Desmarais (1998) found that woman's propensity to pressure men for sex was related to a belief that all men are readily available for sex and that a woman's sex drive is equal to that of a man's. Thus, women who overestimate men's sexual interest may go too far in pressing for sex. Poor communication most likely compounds this situation.

In conclusion, our knowledge of the sexually aggressive woman is presently quite limited. While we have recommended that people study types of sexually aggressive women, there are a plethora of questions to investigate. For instance, almost nothing is known about the characteristics of the male targets of sexually aggressive women. It is not yet determined what acts of female sexual aggression have the most negative impact upon men. We know little about men's strategies for resisting sexually aggressive women. Future research on these questions will ultimately be useful for understanding sexual aggression and for preventing its occurrence

References

Aizenman, M., & Kelley, G. (1988). The incidence of violence and acquaintance rape in dating relationships among college men and women. Journal of College Student Development, 29, 305-311.

Anderson, P. B. (1998). Women's motives for sexual initiation and aggression. In P. B. Anderson and C. Struckman-Johnson (Eds.), Sexually aggressive women: Current perspectives and controversies (pp. 79-93). New York: Guilford.

Anderson, P. B., & Aymami, R. (1993). Reports of female initiation of sexual contact: Male and female differences. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 22, 335-343.

Byers, E. S., & O'Sullivan, L. F. (1998). Similar but different: Men's and women's experiences of sexual coercion. In P. B. Anderson and C. Struckman-Johnson (Eds.), Sexually aggressive women: Current perspectives and controversies (pp.144-168). New York: Guilford.

Clements-Schreiber, M. E., Rempel, J. K., & Desmarais, S. Women's sexual pressure tactics and adherence to related attitudes: A step toward prediction. Journal of Sex Research, 35, 197-205.

Craig, M. S. (1998). When the tab!es are turned: Verbal sexual coercion among college women. In P. B. Anderson and C. Struckman-Johnson (Eds.), Sexually aggressive women: Current perspectives and controversies (pp. 94-104). New York: Guilford.

Christopher, F. S., McQuaid, S., & Updegraff, K. (1999, November). Single women's use of sexual coercion: A symbolic interactional investigation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, St. Louis, MO.

Dean, K., & Malamuth, N. (1997). Characteristics of men who aggress sexually and men who imagine aggressing: Risk and moderating variables. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72, 449-455.

Hogben, M., Byrne, D., Hamburger, M. E. (1996). Coercive heterosexual sexuality in dating relationships of college students: Implication of differential male-female experiences. Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 8, 69-78.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55, 162-170.

Larimer, M. E., Lydum, A. R., Anderson, B. K., & Turner, A. P. (1999). Male and female recipients of unwanted sexual contact in a college sample: Prevalence rates, alcohol use, and depression symptoms. Journal of Sex Research, 40, 295-308.

Lottes, I. I. (1991). The relationship between nontraditional gender roles and sexual coercion. Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 4, 89-109.

Lottes, I. I., & Weinberg, M. (1996). Sexual coercion among university students: A comparison of the United State and Sweden. Journal of Sex Research, 34, 67-76.

McConaghy, N., & Zamir, M. (1995). Heterosexual and homosexual coercion, sexual orientation, and sexual roles in medical students. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 24, 489-502.

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Cook, S. (1988). Men's self reports of unwanted sexual activity. Journal of Sex Research, 24, 58-72.

O'Sullivan, L. F., Byers, E. S., & Finkelman, L. (1998). A comparison of male and female college students' experiences of sexual coercion. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22, 177-195.

Struckman-Johnson, C. J. (1988). Forced sex on dates: It happens to men, too. Journal of Sex Research, 24, 234-240.

Struckman-Johnson, C. J., & Struckman-Johnson, D. L. (1998). The dynamics and impact of sexual coercion of men by women. In P. B. Anderson and C. J. Struckman-Johnson (Eds.), Sexually aggressive women: Current perspectives and controversies (pp. 121-169). New York: Guilford.

Struckman-Johnson, C., Anderson, P. B., Struckman-Johnson, D., & Newton, M. (1998, November). Sexual persistence: The dynamics of men and women pursuing sex after a turn down. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, Los Angeles, CA.

Zurbriggen, E. L. (2000). Social motives and cognitive power-sex associations: Predictors of aggressive sexual behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78, pages unknown-preprint.

Zweig, J. M., Barger, B. L., & Eccles, J. S. (1997). Sexual coercion and well-being in young adulthood: Comparisons by gender and college status. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12, 291-308.